

# In Defence of the Quran



A response to Nick Griffin's criticisms of  
Islam's Holy Book

by Ben Adam

# Contents

Introduction	3
Quran 5:32 ~ The Grievousness of Murder	4
Quran 5:33 ~ Revenge of the Terrorised	10
Quran 27:48-51 ~ The Wrath of God	14
Quran 9:123 ~ Jihad, Just War and the Fall of the Roman Empire	20
Conclusion	29

2009 © Ben Adam

<http://quran.nu/essays/>

[ben\\_adam@rocketmail.com](mailto:ben_adam@rocketmail.com)

All rights reserved

## Introduction

If Islam is a religion of Peace, then either explain or change the Koran.<sup>1</sup>

So demanded Nick Griffin, Chairman of the British National Party, in his Challenge to the Muslim Council of Britain in the summer of 2005, nearly four years to the day.

To be fair to him, the BNP chairman has every right to pick apart, expose and question Muslims as regards allegedly disagreeable passages of the Koran (or Quran); a book Muslims claim to be God's last testament to mankind, His literal uncreated speech as revealed verbatim to and relayed pristinely by His Final Prophet and Messenger, Muhammad. The right to do so is, in fact, enshrined in the Quran itself:

Do they not then consider the Quran carefully? Had it been from other than Allah, they would surely have found therein much contradiction. (Quran 4:82)

This is no less than a direct challenge to the reader and a rather unique one for a purportedly divinely-revealed scripture: find a contradiction, find a discrepancy, disprove the book's assertions and claims, belie its miracles and prophecies, and you are free to disbelieve thereafter; for divine truth is infallible.

Furthermore, when we consider how Al-Qaeda's ideologues and their Al-Muhaji-goon supporters in the UK, like the exiled Umar Bakri's left hand, Anjem Choudary, cite the Quran and other Islamic source texts to justify their deviation, non-Muslims could be forgiven for taking the extremists at their word. Moreover, if those non-Muslims are, like the BNP, gracious enough to make the plea, "If we are wrong then please tell us,"<sup>2</sup> then faithful reciters of the Quran ought to be gracious enough to do just that.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was first published on 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2005, in the Chariman's Column of the official BNP website at <http://www.bnp.org.uk/columnists/chairman2.php?ngld=21>. As the article can no longer be accessed from the original URL, we have made the page available [here](#).

<sup>2</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.

## Quran 5:32 ~ The Grievousness of Murder

Nick Griffin begins his critique of the Quran with the bold statement:

Terrorism; the slaughter of innocents; war against the Unbelievers; mass murder - all are (assuming the words of various Koranic verses are taken to have their ordinary English meanings) 'justified' in the Koran, and anyone who denies this is a liar.<sup>3</sup>

Terrorism, the slaughter of innocents and mass murder are nowhere justified in the Quran. On the contrary, all are expressly forbidden. As for war, against unbelievers or otherwise, it is justified under certain circumstances and conditions - just as any and every human constitution reserves the right to fight when necessary. We shall return to the issue of jihad and warfare later. But first to a Quranic verse or *ayah* that is often cited to illustrate Islam's disapproval of murder. The ayah occurs in the fifth chapter or *Surah* of the Quran and its citation in the media is one which Nick Griffin calls "a deliberate misquotation designed to mislead."<sup>4</sup>

"... whoever kills a soul is like one who has killed the whole of mankind; and whoever saves a life is like one who saves the lives of all mankind."

...The real version of Surah 5. 32 is:

"...whoever kills a soul, not in retaliation for a soul or corruption in the land [emphasis added], is like one who has killed the whole of mankind; and whoever saves a life is like one who saves the lives of all mankind."<sup>5</sup>

Strictly speaking, Nick Griffin is right. Or rather, he is half-right. It is not clear who misquoted the passage as such. Both Tony Blair and Iqbal Sacranie are implied. But, regardless, Nick Griffin's grievance is valid as US President Barack Obama also omitted the same exact phrase (i.e. "not in retaliation for a soul or corruption in the land") when he attempted to quote Quran 5:32 during his highly anticipated address to the Muslim world from Cairo, on 4 June, 2009.

The intention behind the omission, however, was perhaps not to mislead, but rather to *lead* the audience towards the main thrust of the ayah's message: homicide is a grievous criminal sin. The inclusion of the omitted phrase serves only to modify the overall message thus: homicide *of the innocent* or homicide *without due right* is a grievous criminal sin.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

Ironically, Nick Griffin is himself selective in his quote of the said ayah. Here is the verse in full.

We ordained for the Children of Israel that if anyone killed a person not in retaliation for murder, nor for mischief and corruption in the land, it would be as if he killed the whole of mankind. And if anyone saved a life, it would be as if they saved the whole of mankind. And indeed, there came to them Our Messengers with clear signs. But even then, many of them continued to exceed the limits (through sin and transgression) in the land! (Quran 5:32)

The discerning reader will note that the part of the verse that Nick Griffin quotes is itself a quote from scripture that was revealed to the Jews many centuries before the Quran. Unfortunately, that scripture is now lost. Amongst all Holy Books, only the Quran remains fully preserved and unaltered - one of the facts that Muslims will forward to suggest its authenticity as a divinely-revealed text.

Coincidentally, that same lost Israelite scripture that the Quran makes reference to and quotes is also made reference to and partially quoted in the Babylonian Talmud, which also predates the revelation of the Quran. In the Talmud, we find the Rabbinic Mishna sage stating:

He who destroys one soul [of Israel] the Scripture considers him as though he has destroyed the whole world. And he who saves one soul [of Israel] the Scripture considers him as though he saved the whole world.<sup>6</sup>

The words "of Israel" have been placed in parenthesis because they do not appear in all versions of the Talmud. Again, Muslims will argue that there is only one thoroughly consistent version of the Quran precisely because it is incorruptible.

Note also that the Quranic citation is fuller than that of the Talmud as it includes the phrase Nick Griffin takes exception to: "not in retaliation for murder, nor to make mischief and corruption in the land." The Rabbi(s) authoring the particular passage of the Talmud in discussion here probably felt these words were superfluous to the legal point being made (i.e. that homicide is a grievous criminal sin), and so may not have felt compelled to quote them - like Prime Minister Blair(?) and President Obama did with their citation of the Quran several thousand years later. Or it may have been that the editors of the Talmud felt the need to omit this caveat for reasons of political expediency, in the same misguided spirit that Nick Griffin is condemning.

They change the words from their (right) places and have abandoned a good part of the Message that was sent to them. And you will not cease to discover deceit in them,

---

<sup>6</sup> Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, Mishna, chapter 4:5.



except a few of them. But forgive them, and overlook (their misdeeds). Verily, Allah loves the good doers. (Quran 5:13)<sup>7</sup>

In either case, the Talmud's omission does not change the fact that both it and the Jewish Bible which it gives commentary to are in full conformity with the Quran in so far as the legality of killing in retaliation for murder or to protect people from seriously oppressive villainy, mischief and corruption.

Take, for example, Exodus 21:23-5:

And if any mischief follow, then thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

The Quran, again, affirms the divine origin of earlier scripture<sup>8</sup>, including a better part of the above Biblical passage:

And We ordained therein for them (i.e. the Jews): "Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal." But if anyone remits the retaliation by way of charity, it shall be for him an expiation. And whosoever does not judge by that which Allah has revealed, such are the wrong-doers. (Quran 5:45)

After partially quoting ayah 5:32, Nick Griffin then proceeds to give *his* own prejudiced analysis of the verse. "His" analysis because not even Muslim terrorists, neither those behind 9/11 nor 7/7, used this particular verse to justify their evil acts.<sup>9</sup>

First, "in retaliation for a soul". Put yourself for one moment in the shoes of a Muslim who regards (as vast numbers of them, including senior members of the MCB, do) Blair's illegal invasion of Iraq, and the mass slaughter of civilians that has gone with it, as murder. Straight away, blowing up the Number 30 bus is "justified" according to the very Koranic verse that the lie-mongers in the media are using to convince us that the London Massacre was "unIslamic."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Here the Quran affirms the Biblical notion of, "the lying pen of the scribes" (Jeremiah 8:8; Matthew 5:20, 23:13).

<sup>8</sup> And We have sent down to you (O Muhammad) the Book (this Quran) in truth, confirming the Scripture that came before it and a quality witness over it. So judge between them (the People of the Scripture - the Jews and Christians) by what Allah has revealed, and follow not their vain desires, diverging away from the truth that has come to you. (Quran 5:48)

<sup>9</sup> Perhaps old Nick alone is of such a devious mind that he can manipulate wholly innocent religious texts to make them justify terroristic acts of revenge against British civilians?

<sup>10</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.

Not quite. In Islam, enforcement of the law is the sole preserve of the legitimate state authorities.

O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger (Muhammad), and those in authority amongst you. (Quran 4:59)

Those who take the law into their own hands, no matter how aggrieved they may be, are themselves liable to severe punishment as they would be acting in direct contravention of the verse Nick Griffin has misunderstood. That is, according to Islam, vigilantism, usurping the state's authority, acting outside one's own jurisdiction, etc., is a form of "mischief and corruption in the land." (Quran 5:32)

Of course, it could be argued that the Quranic injunction in ayah 4:59, above, compels the believers to show obedience only to a temporal Muslim authority. And that argument certainly holds merit.

Nevertheless, even when the authority under which Muslims may find themselves happens to be un-Islamic in nature, Muslims are still restricted from freely acting as they desire. This is because, In Islamic law, citizenship is interpreted as a covenant like any other covenant between two or more parties.<sup>11</sup> Hence British Muslims (or Muslims residing in Britain, if one prefers) are required to fulfill their part of the contract by obeying the law of the land to the letter, if not in spirit as well.

And fulfill (every) covenant. Indeed, the covenant (you make) is ever (that about which you will be) questioned. (Quran 17:34)

Successful indeed are the believers... those who are faithfully true to their responsibilities and trusts and to their covenants... These are indeed the inheritors who have inherited Paradise. They shall dwell therein forever. (Quran 23:1, 8, 10-1)

So, to be absolutely clear, Islam unequivocally forbids the common man from taking it upon himself to interpret, let alone enforce, Islam's penal code. That Muslim who does take the law into his own hands by killing or attempting to kill those who may or may not deserve to otherwise be killed, has either usurped the rights of his Muslim ruler (in case he resides in an Islamic state) or is in breach of contract (in case he resides in a non-Muslim state). In either case, he is to be considered, by definition, a renegade and a criminal.

---

<sup>11</sup> Incidentally, it is precisely because Islam does not rule over England that Muslims cannot make any religious claims over English soil. The only legitimate rights Muslims have in non-Islamic states are those which the state chooses to give them. The statement: "We're British, Muslim and here to stay!" is merely a (British) legal concept. It is an expression of a civic right, not an expression of any inviolable Islamic right by any means.

Second, "or corruption in the land". Again, it is instantly clear to anyone with any knowledge of the Koran and the Hadiths that all sorts of things that go on in Britain (and, on account of Britain's influence overseas, elsewhere, including the Middle East) that can easily be taken by angry Muslims to be "corruption in the land."<sup>12</sup>

The BNP chairman is, again, only half-right. Corruption in a Quranic context can take a variety of vastly different - though all evil - meanings, including disbelief (16:88), hypocrisy (2:11-2), theft (12:70-3), excessiveness (28:76-7) and even sorcery (10:80-2).

Granted, many of those matters Nick Griffin proceeds to list would be classed as corruption by Islam's highest of moral standards. But the corruption condemned in the context of ayah 5:32 is of a particularly oppressive type. Namely, it is the corruption of spilling innocent human blood, destroying and killing living things, and infringing, usurping or denying the rights of others. Before we establish that such is the context, let us first illustrate with other Quranic passages how the term *fasād* (فساد : corruption, mischief and villainy) can carry a violent and destructive meaning as is covered in ayah 5:32 - no reading of which, no matter how prejudiced, can be contorted to even remotely suggest "pretty girls in short-sleeved summer tops!"<sup>13</sup>

And (mention, O Muhammad), when your Lord said to the angels, "Indeed, I will make upon the earth a successive authority." They said, "Will You place upon it one who causes corruption therein and sheds blood, while we declare Your praise and sanctify You?" Allah said, "Indeed, I know that which you do not know." (Quran 2:30)

And when he turns away, he strives throughout the land to cause corruption and make mischief therein and to destroy crops and animals. And Allah does not like corruption. (Quran 2:205)

Indeed, Pharaoh exalted himself in the land and made its people into factions, oppressing a sector among them, slaughtering their [newborn] sons and keeping their females alive. Indeed, he was of the corrupters. (Quran 28:4)

Now, if the question is asked: how do we know that the corruption punishable by death in ayah 5:32 is from the most severe types condemned in the above three passages? Well, for one, precisely because *it is* punishable by death! In Islam, the punishment must fit the crime. And in this case, the crime is on par with and mentioned alongside murder.

---

<sup>12</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.



...if anyone killed a person not in retaliation for murder, nor for mischief and corruption in the land... (Quran 5:32)

And we have already quoted the verse:

Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal. (Quran 5:45)

That is, "life for life," not "life for short-sleeved summer tops," Mr. Chairman!

Secondly, the verse immediately following Quran 5:32 and the story behind its revelation unmistakably contextualise the whole passage.

## Quran 5:33 ~ Revenge of the Terrorised

The recompense of those who wage war against Allah and His Messenger and do mischief and cause corruption in the land is only that they shall be killed or crucified or their hands and their feet be cut off on the opposite sides, or be exiled from the land. That is their disgrace in this world, and a great torment is theirs in the Hereafter. (Quran 5:33)

Nick Griffin faithfully quotes the above verse to try to further prove his point: that Islam approves of murder. But, as should be clear, this verse only further implies the grievous nature of crimes warranting execution in the previous verse.

Ayah 5:33 is cited by Muslim jurists when discussing the punishment for the crime of *hirāba* (حرابة) which can be translated as banditry, anarchy, terrorising, and so on. That is, it outlines the penalty to be meted out - exclusively by the official architecture of the Islamic state - upon those who terrorise the innocent. It is the most severe and brutal of all corporal punishments in Islam's penal code and even today, Islamic courts will only prescribe it for crimes such as banditry, piracy and armed robbery; rape, especially gang-rape, and serious sexual abuse; kidnapping, pimping and drug-trafficking and, of course, terrorism and mass murder.

Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi, the great sage and jurist of Islamic Spain, defined *hirāba*'s perpetrator as:

One who puts people in fear on the highways, whether with a weapon or without, at night or day, in urban areas or in open spaces, in the palace of a caliph or a mosque, with or without accomplices, in the desert or in the village, in a large or small city, with one or more people... making people fear that they will be murdered, or have money taken, or be raped... whether the attackers are one or many.<sup>14</sup>

What of the given reason for ayah 5:33's revelation? The classical books of Quranic exegesis (Arabic: *Tafsir*) narrate that the verse was revealed to the Prophet only after a group of men who were entrusted by him to the care a shepherd, actually murdered that shepherd and scattered his herd.<sup>15</sup>

Hence, the corruption that is referred to in the previous ayah, 5:32, the corruption which warrants a death penalty, is the corruption of terrorising the innocent.

Take, for example, the case of what Nick Griffin refers to by the utterly misleading term "racial grooming."

---

<sup>14</sup> Cited by Sayyid Sabiq in *Fiqh-us-Sunnah* 2:450, 1993.

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*.

Wherever there are large numbers of young Muslim men, groups of them team up to lure girls - often as young as twelve or thirteen - into a nightmare world of sexual abuse, rape, beatings, drug addiction and prostitution.<sup>16</sup>

Take it straight to any reputable Islamic scholar, particularly those politically incorrect learned imams of the so-called "Wahhabi" school.

Questioner: "Noble shaykh! Here in the UK, we have a disturbing phenomena of the 'grooming' of very young girls by, we are ashamed to say, sometimes Asian men of our Islamic faith, to be prostitutes and drug-trafficking 'joeys.' These young girls happen to be, for the most part, indigenous English, and are singled out because non-believing white females, may Allah whiten your countenance, O shaykh!, are easier to lead astray due to the poor parental discipline and the moral and social decay prevalent in the West. And they are so 'groomed' from their early teens by these men through a combination of pampering with gifts, plying with alcohol, addiction to hard drugs and violent beating - the type of beating, O shaykh!, may Allah show you mercy!, that breaks the bone, bruises the breast, and bloodies the body. So what, O noble shaykh, would be the ruling upon these men if they were ever to be brought before the believing Muslim judge? Allah bless you!"

You could almost guarantee what the answer would be...

Salafi shaykh: "They are to be killed or crucified or their hands and their feet cut off from opposite sides or they are to be exiled from the land."

And how else would a learned man or woman of Islam rule? It may not be the official position of the British National Party that Islam condones, encourages or somehow allows for the despicable kind of behaviour that poor Jane was subjected to,<sup>17</sup> amongst other young English roses mercilessly trampled down before they could blossom, but the party's propaganda has certainly left little other impression in the minds of nationalists and non-nationalists alike.

And in case there remains any doubt as to the utter illegality of so-called racial grooming, then any doubting Thomas' need only ask themselves:

---

<sup>16</sup> BNP pamphlet, *Racism Cuts Both Ways*, page 8.

<sup>17</sup> See [Racial Grooming: The Truth - Part 1](#) [accessed 19 June 2009] for Jane's disturbing story. The video is the first of three victims' interviews introduced by Nick Griffin as damning proof of the racial grooming of predominately English girls by predominately Asian Muslim men [[Racial Grooming: The Truth - Introduction](#) - accessed 19 June 2009]. However, Jane clearly states that it was West African men who groomed her, while the only other ethnicity she recalls is that of an impotent Cypriot client! Most West Africans and Cypriots alike are neither Asian nor Muslim!

If Islam forbids fornication between consenting adults, punishing its perpetrators with the lash; if to merely accuse a woman wrongfully of being unchaste itself warrants the whip upon her slanderer,<sup>18</sup> then how much more worthy of corporal punishment is non-consensual gang rape?

If the production, transportation, sale, pouring and consumption of alcoholic drink is cursed in Islam,<sup>19</sup> described as “an abomination of Satan’s handiwork”<sup>20</sup> by God and as “the Mother all Evil!” by His Prophet, then how much more deserving the curse upon the one who forces it down a captive girl’s throat to deliberately debilitate and have his way with her?

If Islam outlaws alcohol for the fools it makes of men and the evil it makes men do, then how greater an evil and how more foolish the outlaw who deals in drugs far more potent in intoxicating the mind and far more injurious to the soul?

If the mere presence of a young girl behind closed doors with sexually able men who are neither her father, brothers, uncles or grand-fathers is considered a crime scene in Islam, how much more of an outrageous crime is the scene of a girl being pimped before sexually debauched strangers, that they may repeatedly beat up on and feast upon her flesh?

If all these crimes are unambiguously decried by the sharia and are punishable by death in this world and by burning fire in the Next, then how could any fair person possibly vilify Islam for them?

Verily, Allah enjoins justice, goodness and helping (one’s) relatives; and He forbids obscenities, wickedness and all kinds of oppression and extremism. Thus does He admonish you, that you may take heed. (Quran 16:90)

Surely, Islam is the cure, not the cause, of this disease? The very fact that it may be largely non-Muslim English girls being preyed upon by largely Asian and supposedly “Muslim” men is proof enough. British girls who are raised in even nominally-Muslim households would generally never allow their selves or never be allowed to stray near such wickedness. Why else is it that the over-whelming majority of Muslim girls raised in Britain are still virgins upon their graduation from university and will remain so till they marry, whilst the over-whelming majority of indigenous Anglo-Saxon girls have already lost or had stolen their innocence many times over before they have even sat down for their GCSEs?

---

<sup>18</sup> Verily, those who slander chaste women, innocent unsuspecting believing women: they are cursed in this world and the next. And for them will be a great torment. (Quran 24:23)

<sup>19</sup> The Prophet Muhammad warned, in a *hadith* recorded by Abu Dawud: “Allah curses every intoxicant; (along with) the one who drinks it and the one who pours it, the one who sells it and the one who buys it, the one who makes it and the one who asks that it be made for him, the one who delivers it and the one to whom it is delivered.”

<sup>20</sup> Quran 5:90.

Had any "Muslim" been afforded the opportunity to groom a Muslim girl for sex slavery and drug-trafficking, it would be the MCB, not the BNP, interviewing runaways and rehabs for the camera. The truth of the matter is, however, that a Muslim male of ignoble intentions cannot even offer a cigarette or suggestively wink to a young girl from his own religious community without getting lynched!

This is why the term "racial grooming" is so misleading. For it is the religiosity of the victim and her victimiser, or a blatant lack thereof, that creates the seedy climate for this most sordid of pursuits. Race plays only a circumstantial role. Far less a role than the prevalence of drugs, alcohol and street gangs, the absence of corporal punishment and the glorification of hedonism, sugar-daddies and pre-marital sex.

True enough, some Islamic family values are deemed too illiberal for many modern Western tastes. But, if it is true of the BNP that the average Conservative voter thinks in private what the far-right party says in public, it is probably even more of a truism that the average conservative Jew or Christian secretly prays for the kind of society observant Muslims openly live by.

Those (People of the Book, the Jews and Christians) who follow the Messenger (Muhammad), the unlettered Prophet whom they find written in the Torah and the Gospel with them: he enjoins upon them all that is virtuous and forbids them all that is evil; he allows for them all that is good and prohibits for them all that is foul; and he releases them from their burdens and from the shackles that were upon them. So it is those who believe in him, honour him, assist him and follow the light which is sent down with him, it is they who will be successful. (Quran 7:157)

## Quran 27:48-51 ~ The Wrath of God

Take a look at Surah 27. 48, 50 and 51:

"And there were in a city nine individuals, who worked corruption in the land and did not set things right... "They schemed a scheme and We schemed a scheme, while they were unaware. "See, then, what was the outcome of their scheming. We destroyed them together with all their people."

Just nine individuals were "guilty" of unIslamic practices, but all the innocents in their entire city were destroyed with them. And presumably, their buses and tube trains with them.<sup>21</sup>

Let us take a look at the full context of the passage. First, the preceding three verses:

And indeed We sent to Thamud their brother (the Prophet) Salih, saying: "Worship Allah (alone)." Then look! They became two parties (believers and disbelievers) quarrelling with each other. He (Salih) said: "O my people! Why do you seek to hasten the evil before the good? Why seek you not Allah's forgiveness, that you may receive mercy?" They said: "We augur ill omen from you and those with you." He (Salih) said: "Your ill omen is with Allah; nay, but you are a people that are being tested." (Quran 27:45-7)

This is the story of Thamud, an ancient, pre-Islamic people who lived in what is now the northwest of Saudi Arabia, near the eastern coast of the Red Sea. The Thamud were kindred to the Nabateans who built Petra further to north, in what is now Jordan. And, like the Nabateans, the Thamud were masterful stone masons, carving their spectacular city out of mountain rock.

As with many nations past, just prior to their demise, Thamud had reached the pinnacle of their civilisation, amassing great wealth, power and prestige. However, they became ungrateful and forgot themselves and their Lord. They became decadent and corrupt, arrogant and haughty, cruel and oppressive, as they turned to falsehoods and false gods. So, Allah sent to Thamud His Prophet, Salih, supported with miracles and admonitions, to remind them of His Favours and to be dutiful to Him, and to be just and compassionate to each other.

(Salih said to Thamud:) "Will you remain (forever) secure in what you have here? In gardens and springs, well-tilled fields and date-palms heavy with fruit; and while you hew dwellings out of mountains with such great skill?" (Quran 26:146-9)

---

<sup>21</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.



Alas! Thamud disbelieved in spite of their Lord's Clear Signs. They rejected their prophet, Salih, and mocked and scorned him. They even plotted to kill him! This is where Nick Griffin picks up the story.

And there were in the city nine men [from the sons of the chiefs] causing corruption and mischief in the land, and who would not reform. They said: "Take a mutual oath by Allah that we will kill him (the Prophet Salih) by night, he and his household. Then we will say to his executor, 'We did not witness the destruction of his family, and indeed, we are truthful.'" And they planned a plan, and We planned a plan, while they perceived not. Then look how was the outcome of their plan - that We destroyed them and their people, all together. (Quran 27:48-51)

And so, because of Thamud's violent rejection of God's Prophet sent to them, He, Most High, struck them with a violent sonic blast. The divine retribution utterly wiped out Thamud whilst leaving their homes intact. The eerie ruins of the ghost cities of Thamud, known today as *Mada'in Salih*, can still be seen to this day.



These are their houses, in utter ruin, for the wrong that they did. Verily, in this is indeed a lesson for people who know. (Quran 27:52)

So it is neither accurate nor fair to blame Islam by alleging that "Just nine individuals were "guilty" of unIslamic practices, but all the innocents in their entire city were destroyed with them."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

Firstly, those nine "guilty" individuals of Thamud merely represented the murderous high-ranking edge of a thoroughly wicked people.

Secondly, the story is not related to Islam, at least not directly, as it recalls the destruction which befell a people who lived centuries before Muhammad was even born.

Thirdly, the wickedness for which Thamud were ultimately destroyed, attempted propheticide, is not an "unIslamic practice" *per sé*. It is a sacrilege and a blasphemy that any theist, especially, one would presume, a devout believing Christian, would seek refuge from.

Fourthly, the innocents of the city were indeed delivered away from God's wrath and toward His mercy. Obviously, Nick Griffin did not bother to read the following and final verse in the story:

And We saved those who believed and would fear Allah, and keep their duty to Him.  
(Quran 27:53)

Fifthly, the tradition of God punishing entire nations who were in open rebellion against His prophets is not one that has reached us through the Quran alone.

for you suffered like things of your own countrymen as they did from the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out and displease God, and oppose all men... But God's wrath has come upon them at last.<sup>23</sup>

The Prophet Muhammad explained this tradition or *Sunna of Allah* thus:

Indeed, Allah gives respite to the oppressor. But when He seizes him, He does not let him escape!

[He then recited:]

Such is the seizure of your Lord when He seizes the (population of) towns while they are doing wrong. Verily, His seizure is painful, severe. (Quran 11:102)<sup>24</sup>

Sixthly, had Nick Griffin continued to read the next passage, he would have come across a similar story familiar to every good Christian, that of the destruction of the People of Lot.

---

<sup>23</sup> The New Testament, 1 Thessalonians 2:14-16.

<sup>24</sup> This Prophetic tradition or *hadith* is recorded in the collections *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*.

And (remember the story of) Lot! When he said to his people: "Do you commit unlawful sexual intercourse while you watch (one another)? Do you approach men in your lusts rather than women? Nay!, but you are a people who behave senselessly." There was no answer given by his people except that they said: "Drive out the family of Lot from your city. Verily, these are men who want to be clean and pure!" So We saved him and his family, except his wife. We destined her to be of those who remained behind. And We rained down upon them a rain (of stones). So evil was the rain of those who were warned. (Quran 27:54-8)

So, as Nick Griffin has proposed a causal link between the modern-day terrorism and violence perpetrated by Muslim extremists on the one hand and the Quranic retelling of Allah's destruction of Thamud on the other, then he must propose an analogous link between violence perpetrated by Christians on the one hand and the Bible's retelling of Allah's destruction of the Sodomites on the other! For God decimated the enemy of Lot just as He decimated the enemy of his brother-in-prophethood, Salih, sparing none but the few believers amongst them.

What is more, by the same logic, Nick Griffin must now also be prepared to blame God's Holy Wrath upon the disbelievers of nations past for the many thousands upon thousands of "infidel" Iraqi, Afghan and Somali refugees, asylum seekers and economic migrants who continue to wash up on Britain's shores after Anglo-American Christian armies were inspired to interfere in the affairs of Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia respectively.

By the same token, the religion of Islam strongly disparages the Jews' infidelity, their claim to be God's "chosen" people and their violent rejection of the prophets.

Those among the Children of Israel who disbelieved were cursed by the tongue of David and Jesus, son of Mary. That was because they disobeyed (Allah and the Messengers) and were ever transgressing beyond bounds. (Quran 5:78)

Verily, you will find the strongest among men in enmity to the believers are the Jews and those who are polytheists, and you will find the nearest in love to the believers are those who say: "We are Christians." That is because amongst them are priests and monks, and they are not proud. And when they listen to what has been sent down to the Messenger (Muhammad), you see their eyes overflowing with tears because of the truth they have recognised. They say: "Our Lord! We believe; so write us down among the witnesses." (Quran 5:82-3)

Say: "O you Jews! If you pretend that you are friends of Allah to the exclusion of the rest of mankind, then long for death if you are really truthful." (Quran 62:6)

Yet, there exists no evidence of any causal link between such Quranic passages and any Muslim-perpetrated persecution of Jews. Rather, it is correct to say that, as a people, the Jews were never historically persecuted by Muslims. Far from it. Jewish communities peacefully prospered throughout Islamic lands.

As for anti-Semitism, it was imported into the Middle East from Europe as an un-Islamic, non-Islamist misdirection of a strategy for dealing with the failure of the impotent Arab nationalist regimes to check the imposition of the Jewish state upon them following World War II. Prior to that, the Golden Age of the Jews had been in Islamic Spain.

It was in these favourable circumstances that the Spanish Jews came under the rule of Mahometans, as whose allies they esteemed themselves the equals of their co-religionists in Babylonia and Persia. They were kindly treated, obtained religious liberty, of which they had so long been deprived, were permitted to exercise jurisdiction over their co-religionists, and were only obliged, like the conquered Christians, to pay poll tax...<sup>25</sup>

The largest synagogue in Europe was built and remains in Sarajevo, the capital of Islamic Bosnia. While in Istanbul, the capital of the Ottoman state itself, we read:

Here in the land of the Turks we have nothing to complain of. We possess great fortunes; much gold and silver are in our hands. We are not oppressed with heavy taxes and our commerce is free and unhindered. Rich are the fruits of the earth. Everything is cheap and every one of us lives in peace and freedom...<sup>26</sup>

And still today, at opposite ends of the Middle East, in the ethnically non-Arab countries of Morocco and Iran, long-standing Jewish communities are still prospering amongst majority Muslim populations, just as they had been traditionally amongst their Arab cousins.

The Jews are not persecuted by the Arabs in these parts. I have travelled through the country in its length and breadth, and none of them has put an obstacle in my way. They are very kind to strangers, particularly to anyone who does not know the language; and if they see many Jews together they are not annoyed by it. In my opinion, an intelligent man versed in political science might easily raise himself to be chief of the Jews as well as of the Arabs...<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Heinrich Graetz, 19<sup>th</sup> century Jewish historian.

<sup>26</sup> From the Rabbi's letter as cited in Phillip Mansel's *Constantinople*.

<sup>27</sup> Italian Rabbi, Obadiah Yareh Da Bertinoro, writing to his father of his visit to Jerusalem in 1486.

In summary, the Quran's retelling of God's punishment upon a wicked people before Islam does not and never has served as a justification for believers after Islam to persecute those outside their faith.

## Quran 9:123 ~ Just war and the fall of the Roman Empire

To his credit, the leader of the British nationalists attempts to deal justly with what he perceives as the blatant inconsistency of Islam's much-acclaimed tradition of peaceful co-existence with non-Muslims. [And again, with all that we see in the media, one could hardly blame him, right?!]

Despite some undoubtedly tolerant verses (mainly in chapters written early in Muhammad's career, which are widely regarded by Islamic scholars as having been abrogated by chapters received later, and therefore to be ignored when they clash with the more blood-thirsty material that emerged once the Prophet had a big enough army to win by force of arms instead of guile) the overall impact of the Koran in a society that is not yet Islamic is to institutionalise hate against all who will not bow to Allah.

One example will suffice, Surah 9. 123:

**"O you who believe, fight those of the unbelievers who live near to you and let them see how harsh you can be."**<sup>28</sup>

Let us deal with the issue of abrogation first.

While it is true that some earlier verses of Quran were abrogated, it is not true to say that the later abrogating verses represented "more blood-thirsty material" or that they resulted in some regression in tolerance. If anything, the Prophet's tolerance increased in proportion to his political power.

Preaching co-existence and compassion towards one's fellow man was a constant moral force in Islam and a reason why so many of the down-trodden and persecuted responded to Muhammad's initial calling in Mecca. But it was only with the structure of the archetypal Islamic state of Medina at his disposal, and all that it entailed of political, economic and military power, that the Prophet was able to practice that tolerance on an unprecedented institutional level.

With Medina behind him, Muhammad immediately began granting refuge and asylum to those who requested it, arbitrating for peace and enforcing peace treaties between warring factions, guaranteeing security to neighbours and safe passage to travellers, spending in charity upon the poor and needy, punishing those who oppressed the weak and vulnerable, forcefully advocating for the rights of those who had prior been denied them, and showing magnanimity and granting amnesty on his vanquished persecutors.

---

<sup>28</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.



The great scholar and polyglot, Thomas W. Arnold, in his magnum opus, *The Spread of Islam in the World*, p.34:

...it is important to show that Muhammad, when he found himself at the head of a band of armed followers, was not transformed at once, as some would have us believe, from a peaceful preacher into a fanatic, sword in hand, forcing his religion on whomever he could.

As for the verses related to jihad specifically, a few were abrogated, but these abrogations had no bearing on matters of tolerance whatsoever. For example, Surah At-Tawba, the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Quran, verse 41,

March forth, whether you are light (being healthy, young and wealthy) or heavy (being ill, old and poor) and strive hard with your wealth and your lives in the Cause of Allah. This is better for you, if you but knew. (Quran 9:41)

and verse 120,

It was not becoming of the people of Medina and the bedouins of the neighbourhood to remain behind Allah's Messenger and to prefer their own lives to his life. That is because they suffer neither thirst nor fatigue, nor hunger in the Cause of Allah, nor do they take any step to raise the anger of disbelievers nor inflict any injury upon an enemy, but it is written to their credit as a deed of righteousness. Surely, Allah wastes not the reward of the good-doers. (Quran 9:120)

were abrogated by verse 122,

And it is not (proper) for the believers to go out to fight all together. Of every troop of them, a party only should go forth, so that they (who are left behind) may get instruction in religion, and that they may warn their people when they return to them, so that they may beware (of any danger). (Quran 9:122)

The wisdom behind the abrogation can perhaps be easily understood with a sporting analogy. The first two abrogated verses are similar in case to a football club winning a corner in the dying minutes of the final match of their make-or-break season. In order to increase their chances of scoring, which they must do if they are to avoid relegation, even the goalkeeper is required to throw caution to the wind by coming off his own goal-line and into the penalty area of the opposing team.

The third, abrogating verse can be likened to when that same football club, now well-seasoned and boasting many a talented substitute, is in a commanding position at the other end to the league table. They still need to play strong attacking football to ensure they do not lose all that their hard work has earned on the pitch. At the same time, however, they are wary of the threat posed by the opposing team's own attacking players. And so, the goalkeeper and his defenders remain steadfast at their positions, while the mid-fielders man-mark the other side's always-dangerous strikers.

In either case, there is no threat of any hooligans attacking the home-team's well-behaved supporters, and certainly not the women and children amongst them - provided that is, they do not invade the pitch!

Sporting analogies aside, the fact remains that all the verses of combative jihad - without exception - were revealed in relation to the open warfare that raged from time to time between the Prophet and his followers at Medina and those, for the most part, fratricidal pagan forces who were Hell-bent on destroying them.

Even the imperative to spill blood during jihad was also reduced as Muhammad's power grew, proving that the intent was only to ensure that the fledgling Muslim community would survive the existential threat it was facing from the disbelieving Meccans - after having already fled to Medina to escape their violent persecutions.

For example, following the Muslims' first major military engagement with their persecutors at the Battle of Badr, the victorious Prophet sought the council of his closest companions, Abu Bakr and Umar (who were to become the first and second caliphs of Islam respectively), as to what to do with the POWs.

Abu Bakr suggested that they ransom the prisoners back to their tribes. Umar, on the other hand, argued against freeing the prisoners because the Muslim community was still too weak to risk them regrouping with the remnant of the enemy at Mecca and return to threaten the Muslims again. In the end, the Prophet inclined towards Abu Bakr's suggestion and declared: "Any prisoner who teaches ten Muslims to read, shall go free!" Ultimately, it was the wrong decision:

It is not for a Prophet that he should have prisoners of war [and free them with ransom] until he has made a great slaughter (among his enemies) in the land. You desire the good of this world, but Allah desires (for you) the Hereafter. And Allah is All-Mighty, All-Wise. (Quran 8:67)<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> This is one of several passages in the Quran where the Prophet was openly rebuked by Allah. Had the Quran been written by Muhammad, Muslims argue, he would not have placed himself at the sharp end of God's reprimand and disapproval.

Looking at the situation dispassionately, no military commander would argue against the logic, no less squander the opportunity, of finishing off the enemy whilst he still could, lest they recover, regroup and return to finish him off! The nature of the Prophet, however, was that he was keen to spare life at every opportunity and under any praiseworthy pretext, even the disbelieving souls of those who fought so hard to extinguish his own light.

By the grace of Allah, you (O Muhammad) are gentle towards the people; if you had been stern and hard-hearted, they would have dispersed from round about you. (Quran 3:159)

Later on, once the war had taken its full toll and the Muslims had secured their position, cemented their victory, satisfied the urge for vengeance and taught the remainder of the enemy a valuable lesson - causing them to think twice before contemplating any further attack - only then were the Muslims consequently permitted to take and ransom any prisoners of war. Thus, the blood-shed actually subsides as the upper-hand is gained - the opposite of what Nick Griffin claims.

So if you gain the mastery over them in war, punish them severely in order to disperse those who are at their rear, so that they may learn a lesson. (Quran 8:57)

The fundamental difference between Islam and other religions' concepts of just war is that, in the case of Islam, the source texts clearly set out the limits of war. For example:

And fight in Allah's Cause those who fight you, but do not transgress the limits (of war set by Allah). Truly, Allah loves not the transgressors. (Quran 2:190)

And what is wrong with you that you do not fight in the Cause of Allah and for those weak and oppressed among men, women and children whose only cry is: "Our Lord! Rescue us from this town whose people are oppressors, and raise for us from You one who will protect, and raise for us from You one who will help!" (Quran 4:75)

Except those of the polytheists with whom you have a treaty, and who have not subsequently failed you in aught, nor have supported anyone against you. So fulfill their treaty to them to the end of their term. Surely Allah loves the pious. (Quran 9:4)

But if they violate their oaths after their covenant, and attack your religion with disapproval and criticism, then fight the leaders of disbelief - for surely their oaths are nothing to them - in order that they may desist. (Quran 9:12)

And if you punish (your oppressors), then punish them with the like of that with which you were afflicted. But if you endure patiently, it is indeed better for those who are patient. (Quran 16:126)

And if any of the pagan (enemy) seeks your protection then grant it - in order that he may hear the Word of Allah - and escort him to where he can be secure. That is because they are men who do not know. (Quran 9:6)

Allah does not forbid you to deal justly and kindly with those who fought not against you on account of religion, nor drove you out of your homes. Verily, Allah loves those who deal with equity. (Quran 60:8)

After considering the above verses with an open mind - none of the which, by the way, have been abrogated - it becomes immediately apparent that the Islamic code of war explicitly calls for equity and justice; always taking the side of the oppressed - believer or disbeliever - against the oppressor, advising leniency and a quick resolution to war in favour of a lasting peace.

And make ready against them all you can of (military) power, including steeds of war, to terrify the enemy of Allah... But if they incline towards peace, you too incline to it, and trust in Allah. (Quran 8:60-1)

Whenever and wherever the just war is to be fought, the believer is commanded to stand steadfast, fighting harshly and decisively, and slaughtering, toward a speedy surrender, none but the surrounding soldiers. This is precisely how the last Quranic verse that Nick Griffin takes issue with is to be understood, no part of which calls for the wanton persecution and slaughter of infidels:

O you who believe! Fight those of the disbelievers who are close to you, and let them find harshness in you, and know that Allah is with those who are pious. (Quran 9:123)

The verse is actually the last in a passage that was revealed in relation to the Prophet's march against the Roman Empire,<sup>30</sup> known to historians as the Expedition of Tabuk. Many may be surprised to learn that Islam actually holds Western Christendom with a certain regard. Alternatively referred to as "the Romans" and the "Banu Asfaar (i.e. the blondes)", but meaning Westerners or Europeans in general, the Prophet and his Companions had praised aspects of Western civilisation and culture.

---

<sup>30</sup> See <http://en.quran.nu/9>, verses 117-23.

Al-Mustawrid al-Qurashi said to Amr b. al-Aas: "I heard Allah's Messenger (Muhammad) saying, 'The (Last) Hour will begin when the Romans (i.e. Westerners or Europeans) are the greatest people in number.'" Amr said, "Watch what you say!" Al-Mustawrid replied, "I am saying what I heard from Allah's Messenger." Amr then said, "If you say that, then it is fact, for they have four (praiseworthy) qualities: they are the most patient of people at times of tribulation; they recover quickly from calamity; they are quick to recover and attack again after defeat; and they are good to the poor, orphans and the weak. And a fifth good quality that they have is that they resist the oppression of kings."<sup>31</sup>

The 30<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Quran, Surah ar-Rum (i.e. "Chapter of the Romans"), was revealed on the occasion of the defeat of the Romans by Persian arms, and the subsequent mourning of the Prophet Muhammad for the Christians' loss.

Nevertheless, when the Byzantine Emperor made known his hostility to the Prophet, Muhammad took the initiative and set out with his Companions to face off Heraclius' formidable legions at the frontier between Arabia and Byzantium. This is what is meant by "[Fight those of the disbelievers who are close to you.](#)" That is, the Islamic state is to set out against any hostile disbelieving state on its immediate periphery. And the hostile state, according to Islamic military jurisprudence, is the one that does not have or refuses a treaty of peace with the Muslim sovereign.

[So if they withdraw from you, and fight not against you, and offer you peace, then Allah has left no way \[i.e. justification or pretext\] for you \(to fight\) against them. \(Quran 4:90\)](#)

What ayah 9:123 most certainly does not do is give sanction for Muslims in Britain and elsewhere to beat up, stab up or blow up their non-Muslims neighbours, as has been misconstrued from the translation. If such was the case, then the Prophet would have led by example by fighting his own non-Muslim neighbours. Instead, we learn from the Prophet a very different conduct.

In Mecca, the Prophet had a pagan female neighbour who would routinely throw filth and garbage upon him as he passed her home. One day, the noticeable absence of the Prophet's abuser concerned him so much that he enquired after her. When he learnt of her sickness, he visited her. She was so taken aback by his merciful concern that she embraced Islam.

[Repel \(the evil of your foe\) with what is better: then lo! the one between whom and you was enmity \(will come to you\) as if he were a dear friend. \(Quran 41:34\)](#)

---

<sup>31</sup> Recorded in the *hadith* collection of *Sahih Muslim*.

Later, when he migrated to the city of Medina, the Prophet became neighbour to a Jew. The Companions who witnessed the Prophet's dealings with his Hebrew neighbour remarked how they were convinced that the Jew was going to inherit from the Prophet on account of how well Muhammad treated him! Hardly surprising in light of the following *hadith*:

[The Angel] Gabriel would continue to enjoin upon me the kind treatment of neighbours, so much so that I thought he was going to order me to make them my heirs.<sup>32</sup>

In any event, when the Romans heard of the march of their Arab neighbours, they lost their nerve and opted for a no-show. Shortly after the Prophet's passing, the Muslim forces under the command of his immediate successor, Abu Bakr, set out to liberate Syria from the Romans. Abu Bakr admonished the Muslim army with the following words:

Halt, O people, that I may give you ten rules for your guidance in the battlefield. Do not commit treachery or deviate from the right path. You must not mutilate dead bodies. Neither kill a child, nor a woman, nor an aged man. Bring no harm to the trees, nor burn them, especially those which are fruitful. Slay not any of the enemy's flock, save for your food. You are likely to pass by people who have devoted their lives to monastic services; leave them alone.

Not only was Syria won but, between Abu Bakr and *his* successor, Umar, the army of Islam captured most of the territory of the two super-powers of their age, the Persian and Roman empires, including the latter's religious heartland. This feat,

The creation within the space of a single century of a vast Arab empire stretching from Spain to India is one of the most extraordinary marvels of history. The speed, magnitude, extent and permanence of these conquests excite our wonder and almost affront our reason.<sup>33</sup>

While in Europe, Christianity had morphed into a Trinitarian confession to placate the Greco-Roman elite and their man-God mythology, in the Near Eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, Christianity's birthplace, the more Unitarian and monotheistic Churches were still popular. It is no small coincidence, therefore, that the very lands where Jesus' disciples, in fact, the very regions were all the Biblical prophets had lived and taught; namely, Syria (including Palestine), Egypt, Iraq, Persia and Arabia, quickly became the greatest fountains of Islamic civilisation.

---

<sup>32</sup> Recorded in the *hadith* collection of *Sahih al-Bukhari*.

<sup>33</sup> J. J. Saunders, *A History of Medieval Islam*, 1928, p. 39.



After all, the over-whelming majority of the region's Christians welcomed the Muslims as liberators,<sup>34</sup> Islam as the fulfilment of God's plan for humanity, and Muhammad as Christ's natural and prophesised successor.<sup>35</sup>

Those to whom we gave the Scripture (of the Torah and the Gospel) recognise him (Prophet Muhammad) as they recognise their own sons. (Quran 2:146)

The chivalry and compassion underlining Islamic military jurisprudence was attested to time and again by visiting and resident Jews and Christians in Syria and the Levant. For example, Oliverus Scholasticus' well-known praise for how, during the Crusades, Sultan al-Kamil fed the defeated Frankish army with Muslim provisions:

Who could doubt that such goodness, friendship and charity come from God? Men whose parents, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, had died in agony at our hands, whose lands we took, whom we drove naked from their homes, revived us with their own food when we were dying of hunger and showered us with kindness even when we were in their power.<sup>36</sup>

Truly, if the order to "Fight those of the disbelievers who are close to you, and let them find harshness in you" intended anyone other than the oppressive regimes and the military elites that kept them in power, then Abu Bakr, dispatching another army to Syria, would not have addressed it saying:

You will find some people with shaved heads. Therefore, strike the swords upon the parts that contain the devil! For, by Allah!, it is better to me to kill one of these people than to kill seventy other men; (and) that is because Allah said: "then fight the leaders of disbelief" (Quran 9:12).<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> "...the early Caliphs, who enjoyed a rare ingenuity which was unavailable to the propagandists of new faiths, realized that laws and religion cannot be imposed by force. Hence they were remarkably kind in the way they treated the peoples of Syria, Egypt, Spain and every other country they subdued, leaving them to practice their laws and regulations and beliefs and imposing only a small jizya [a poll tax able non-Muslims pay the Islamic State in lieu of military service] in return for their protection and keeping peace among them. In truth, nations have never known merciful and tolerant conquerors like the Arabs." (Gustave Le Bon, *La civilisation des Arabes*, 1884)

<sup>35</sup> Frankly-speaking, if Islam is a religion for wogs because its prophet was a Semitic wog (God forgive such an utterance!), then the prophet associated with Christianity was no less a Semitic wog, with a similar diet, dress code and modes of worship. As the Prophet Muhammad said: "I am nearest of all people to Jesus, the son of Mary, in this world and the Hereafter. The prophets are paternal brothers: their mothers are different but their religion is one." (Narrated by Abu Hurayra in *Sahih al-Bukhari*)

<sup>36</sup> Judge Weeramantry, Christopher G. (1997), *Justice Without Frontiers*, Brill Publishers, pp. 136-7.

<sup>37</sup> *Hadith* collected by Ibn Abi Hatim.

Likewise, if the Quran was commanding the believers to persecute and treat harshly every common disbeliever, the Muslims would not have exhibited such kindness and compassion to the general populous they came to rule over. Nor would a single church or temple be left standing anywhere in the Middle East.

Yet, we find the oldest, most sacred of Christian and Jewish shrines and the earliest, most authentic of Jewish and Christian communities thriving amidst their Muslim neighbours. At least that was the case until Western Zionist democracies cynically planted a militant and racist Jewish state in Palestine!

## Conclusion

John Walker of the BNP Press Office recently stated: "There are probably many issues that we as Nationalists agree with the Muslim peoples of the world." <sup>38</sup>

Indeed, from certain perspectives, the juxtapositioning of orthodox Muslims against the BNP is a somewhat curious dichotomy. For one, there is nothing inherent in the teachings of Islam that should cause particular offence to the BNP any more than it should to any and every other group or class of non-Muslim.

In fact, as Peoples of the Book, both the Christian Little Englander and the apartheid-embracing Israeli Jew are theologically closer to Muslims and therefore have more right to be presented Islam by them than, say, the socialist, equal opportunities advocating Hindu or atheist, or any number of non-Islamic creeds whom Britain's Muslims are encouraged to unite with against the racist Islamophobes.

As defenders of the traditional heterosexual family unit, as avowed and proud believers in Christ (or one historically-inaccurate version of him in any regard! <sup>39</sup>), as advocates of a anti-imperialist foreign policy, <sup>40</sup> and as proponents of indigenous peoples remaining masters of their own homelands, <sup>41</sup> with the right spin, the BNP might even consider canvassing for a Muslim vote or two! It is not as though Nick Griffin is inconsistent with his admission that votes, not ideology, drive his party's relatively new-found passion for Islamophobia.

We bang on about Islam. Why? Because to the ordinary public out there it's the thing they can understand. It's the thing the newspaper editors sell newspapers with. If we were to attack some other ethnic group – some people say we should attack the Jews ... But ... we've got to get to power. <sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> John Walker, [The BNP's Statement \(to Muslims\)](#) [accessed 1 June 2009].

<sup>39</sup> St. Paul of Tarsus, not Jesus of Nazareth, is rightly regarded as the actual founder Christianity due to his introducing the cult of the cross and his deifying the person of Christ after the latter's ascension to heaven.

<sup>40</sup> This sentiment probably stems from the hope that if Third World Muslim societies were allowed to achieve, develop and practice real political sovereignty and autonomy, free from the interference of their former colonial masters, the overwhelming majority of Western Europe's Muslims would be encouraged and/or obliged to quit the West, especially for Islamist states. Or, at the very least, the pretext for many seeking asylum would disappear.

<sup>41</sup> Unless you happen to be Irish or Palestinian! In which case, the BNP supports the division and colonisation of your ancestral homeland by hostile foreign occupiers and paramilitary settlers.

<sup>42</sup> Speech to local party activists in Burnley, March 2006.  
[http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=1269630805284168668\\_speech](http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=1269630805284168668_speech), [accessed June 2009].

We should be positioning ourselves to take advantage for our own political ends of the growing wave of public hostility to Islam currently being whipped up by the mass media.<sup>43</sup>

We reject both pro-Zionist internationalism... and the Islamification of our homelands. Which enemy is it in our political interest to be seen to be opposing more vigorously at the moment? To a party aiming to win seats in London, the West Midlands and the former mill-towns of Northern England, the answer should be pretty obvious.<sup>44</sup>

With the theological misunderstandings hopefully addressed in the preceding pages, what remains of the BNP's enmity towards Islam now becomes entirely circumstantial: namely, most Muslims in Britain today happen to be non-white.<sup>45</sup> But, alas! the BNP cannot win elections on the expression of such latent racist sentiments alone. Instead, as Nick Griffin candidly admits above, his party has opted to make Islam the enemy because the threat of fervent Islam is a bandwagon which even the Anglo-Saxon chavette infatuated with Arsenal's Franco-African squad can be convinced to join.

Consequently, the focus on *Islam the religion* is no more than a populist tactic designed to win the BNP votes and mask their real angst: immigration, race-mixing and the failure of Europe's non-Muslim tribes to sustain their own numbers. The real phobias remain demographics and race, not dogma and religion.<sup>46</sup>

If we are wrong then please tell us. We genuinely want to hear what you have to say on these matters, and will gladly publish your response on our website.<sup>47</sup>

We hope and expect you will be true to your word by duly publishing this response. For our part, we promise that we will publish and disseminate in full any rebuttal, counter-response or clarification you may have to offer.

---

<sup>43</sup> Nick Griffin, [By their fruits \(or lack of them\) shall you know them](#), *Chairman's Column*, 21 March 2006 [accessed June 2009].

<sup>44</sup> Cited in [BNP and Islamophobia](#) [accessed June 2009].

<sup>45</sup> This reality may eventually change, considering how Islam is the fastest growing religion amongst white Europeans whilst Christianity is the fastest growing religion amongst black Africans. The BNP chairman himself acknowledges that "*In Europe now the largest growing Christian community is the black community and there are very significant numbers of white Muslims.*" -Nick Griffin, [The Islamization of Europe](#), 24 October 2007, (1:10).

<sup>46</sup> See Anthony Wymer, [The Limits of "Islamophobia"](#), Summer 2008 [accessed 28 February 2009].

<sup>47</sup> Nick Griffin, [A challenge to Iqbal Sacranie and the Muslim Council of Britain](#), 9 July 2005.

وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَاٰنُ قَوْمٍ عَلَىٰٓ اَلَّا تَعْدِلُوْا اَعْدِلُوْا هُوَ اَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوٰی

And let not the hatred of a people prevent you from justice towards them. (Nay!) Be just: that is closer to piety.

Quran 5:8